

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#250: Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program**

Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review** #1  
#2

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding** #1  
#2  
#3

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 250

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	<b>The stock assessment and identification of critical areas is worthwhile but value of the full project declines substantially in years two and three as little further insight is likely. Variation in three years tells little that can guide restoration and is not part of any formal mechanism of analysis. Use of the watershed assessment to improve definition of the problem and sharpen focus would have helped the proposal. The deployment of temperature and flow gages are not tied to data on juvenile migration, the use of "correlation" approaches to explain results is very weak, and no useful "model" is likely to emerge. The need for stock assessment information and the potential for later monitoring after changing flow conditions are important factors but are outweighed by weaknesses in the current proposal.</b>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

**The goal of obtaining data on the nature and time of runs in this stream system is appropriate. The goals and justification for making correlations with temperature and flow are weak and the resulting information may be of little explanatory value.**

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

**It is already apparently known sufficiently that parts of all the streams suffer from problems of inadequate flow and excessive temperature so the existing monitoring network may provide little more than confirmation of this fact. From the background work already conducted it would have been helpful to have some description of what is known about water diversions or causes of high water temperature and whether these are more or less severe in some tributaries. As presented, the project effort and cost are high for equal effort at all locations. Performance evaluation resides in the release of data reports and presentations rather than a consideration of whether counts, or surveys or any other measurement is producing accurate information.**

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

**Outcomes, except for the stock assessment, after the first year would be modest and offer little additional information but at substantial additional cost. Explanation for differences among sites or factors affecting survival will not result from the current study design. The use of one year of data could usefully be employed to identify problem areas more closely and to structure a monitoring plan tied to a better description of focused objectives.**

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**Costs for the full project are high because the benefit of second and third years of data will be minor. Temperature and flow data will provide only the most general information on timing of movement into tributaries and the overall project is too unstructured for testing of useful hypotheses.**

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**Regional Review rated this project MEDIUM because the cost is high for the expected outcomes. The project lacks identified entity to perform the work and thus performance measures or judgment of qualifications is impossible. The proponents have established a good local network and watershed assessment and works closely with agencies.**

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

**The project may need permits but no evidence for this cost is in the budget. Previous work on projects has been fine and well coordinated with agencies. The budget has inconsistencies that must be resolved in budget details.**

#### **Miscellaneous comments:**

**Little use has been made of the watershed assessment for this basin. Tables summarizing discrete observations do not reflect what the assessment has developed for evaluating problems by location.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 250

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

Overall Ranking:    -Low    **XMedium**    -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**The committee ranked this proposal "medium". The proposed project would help to gather important information, but it is too expensive and an entity to perform the work has not been identified.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**People in the Cow Creek Watershed have formed an active local watershed group. The information to be gained by monitoring fish and water quality will address needs/help to fill the knowledge gap identified in their draft Watershed Assessment (WA)-- scanty information on fish runs and water quality (specifically flows). Several actions in the WA call for the information that is identified in this proposal.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**ERP Goals: chinook as a harvestable species, life history info, CALFED Science Program: Goal 1 At risk species, Bioregional priorities, CVPIA objectives: Priority species, restoration priorities, etc.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The Cow Creek watershed group is "young"; this is the first time that they have requested funding from CALFED. Their Watershed Assessment (WA) is in its initial stages (it may even be complete by now) and the WA calls for information to be gathered on the topics identified in the proposal.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

**Yes, the project would involve local people. It is unclear if the project would involve local institutions since the contractor to perform the work is not identified. The information gathered as part of this proposed project would be shared at workgroup meetings and with the existing newsletter. The group follows the CRMP process and includes representation from a diversity of stakeholders; this leads to a seemingly strong process.**

Other Comments:

**Where is the citation to the recently completed report by Shasta College/Institute for Sustainable Communities on Cow Creek water quality? It would have been helpful to refer to this initial project (funded by AFRP) as the preliminary gathering of water quality information on Cow Creek. Please consider referencing it in the final report for this project. Also, the full citation for the draft/final Watershed Assessment is lacking.**

## External Scientific: #1

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **250**

Applicant Organization: **Western Shasta Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**None**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<b>X</b> Excellent	<b>The data should contribute to the fisheries inventory database. Sampling methods are used by other Pacific states.</b>
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**The project goals, objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

**The justification is clear to maintain fish runs, sufficient flow and desirable temperature must be achieved.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**The study clearly outlines the tasks to be conducted over the 3 year period.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**Sampling methods are used extensively in the Pacific states.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**Measures and data generated will be evaluated by the CCWIG technical advisory committee. An extensive list of measures are detailed to get the information disseminated to interest groups and other researchers and government entities**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**The data and information will be used for this area and to contribute to the fisheries inventory databases.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**The team has adequate experience as a collective whole.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**Cost share partner is DFG for \$26,961 and a potential for the Cow Creek Watershed Management Group (CCWMG) of \$10,000. I suggest the CCWMG become a partner if project is funded.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **250**

Applicant Organization: **Western Shasta Resource Conservation District**

Proposal Title: **Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**none**

#### Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>The project is worthwhile on a one year basis but value declines substantially in the next two years as little further insight is likely. Variation in three years tells little that can guide restoration and is not part of any formal mechanism of analysis.</b>
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**The goal to obtain systematic data on characteristics of the fish migrating in Cow Creek and its tributaries is reasonable. The goal of using streamflow and temperature to establish "correlations" is weak and may be of little utility.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

**The lack of much information on the fish populations of this potentially important stream is significant. It would also be useful to obtain data on streamflow, temperature and other water quality conditions in this basin. It is already apparently known sufficiently that parts of all the streams suffer from problems of inadequate flow and excessive temperature so the existing monitoring network may provide little more than confirmation of this fact. From the background work already conducted it would have been helpful to have some description of what is known about water diversions or causes of high water temperature and whether these are more or less severe in some tributaries. As given, the effort and cost are high for equal effort at all locations. This may reflect the status of current understanding, however, although not explained in the proposal.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**Very basic collection of data is a first step. But three years of this kind of data will not significantly contribute more understanding than one year. Although year-to-year variation in runoff and fish populations are to be expected, this fact may not require such a heavy investment of monitoring and cost. Alternatively, the proponents could use a single year of this extensive monitoring to refine hypotheses about subbasins and locations or conditions for more intensive survey and observation.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**As noted, the techniques and approaches proposed are standard and routine and should be possible under most circumstances. Using data on flow and temperature at this level to create correlations will have little value beyond identification of critical conditions.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**Performance evaluation resides in the release of data reports and presentations rather than a consideration of whether counts, or surveys or any other measurement is producing accurate information.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**The project will develop some data consistently for the several subbasins and stream as a whole and gain initial insight to fish population use of the stream. There is little evidence that reasons for differences among the stream branches or overall abundance will be better understood. Nevertheless, this work will expand considerably the current base of knowledge about this stream and with additional work over time could lead to better management.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**There is some evidence that a supporting group is in place to assist in oversight and management of this project. A number of other projects have been completed in the basin under the proponents to demonstrate their ability to manage such a program.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**The justification for three years worth of the same information is not substantiated by the presumed benefits. One year will provide most of the knowledge needed to fashion either more detailed monitoring or efforts at restoration tied to monitoring of results.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 250

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**99-N16, A Clear Creek Prescription, ERP.**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**N/A**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2**

**New Proposal Number:** 250

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**98- F15, Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project, Phase II, CALFED ERP**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**Cooperator submits timely and accurate quarterly reports and is very responsive to Project Officer inquiries**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3**

**New Proposal Number:** 250

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**AFRP: Battle Creek Your Watershed at Work FY 2000 and Battle Ck Watershed Strategy (1448-11330-97-JO75, #30-1A)**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No ☒N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## Environmental Compliance:

**Proposal Number:** 250

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

**Start with a Section 7 Consultation and let USFWS determine if a Section 10 Permit is required. If a Section 10 Permit is necessary for incidental take, a Habitat Conservation Plan is also required.**

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

**Applicant is allowing 6 months for CEQA/NEPA compliance which is adequate. Did not find specific budgeting for permits or environmental documentation.**

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 250

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish & Water Quality Baseline Monitoring Program

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

**difference of \$26,961.00**

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: